

Wing C2068

**Queen's University  
Library**

**KINGSTON, ONTARIO**









THE  
CHARITY and LOYALTY

Of some of our

C L E R G Y .

I N

A short-View of Dr. M's SERMON  
before their Majesties at *Hampton-  
Court*, July the 14<sup>th</sup>, 1689. Where-  
in he still charges the Protestant Dis-  
senters with Schism.

With some occasional Remarks upon a Clergy-  
mans Considerations for taking the Oath of  
Allegiance to King WILLIAM and Queen  
• MARY.

And upon the History of Passive Obedience since the  
Reformation.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Richard Janeway* in Queen's-head-Court in  
*Pater-noster-Row*, MDCLXXXIX.

1689.C437  
Acq 11

CHARITY and LOYALTY

OF THE

# CLEARY

IN

A more View of Dr. H. S. Sermon  
before the Meeting at New-  
York, Sept. 17. 1789. With  
in it will charge the Protestants  
to unite with God.

By the Rev. Mr. S. S. S. S. S.  
New York, Printed by S. S. S. S. S.  
1789.

Printed and Sold by S. S. S. S. S.

Printed by S. S. S. S. S.  
New York, 1789.



---



---

T H E  
 CHARITY and LOYALTY  
 Of some of our  
 C L E R G Y.

S I R,

**Y**OU might well be backward in crediting the Account I gave you of Dr. M's seeming pacific Sermon: Yet I hope now it is out in Print, you are abundantly satisfied, that though he would not be

thought to *repine at the Indulgence now granted to the several Dissenters amongst us*; he cannot forbear the old charitable Appellation of *Schismatics*: And I think there can be no greater Evidence of being in a Passion, of one sort or other, than the giving hard Words, or calling Names. To do this before the glorious *Repairers* of those *Breaches* which some among us would be continually making, you may well believe not to be very discreet: But there is a certain Bigottry which, I may say, fatally transports some Men.

When the chief Managers against the *Protestant Dissenters* seem'd weary or ashamed of those Arguments, which they by sad Experience found

found equally serviceable to the Papists: when the *Political Union* between Christ and Believers yielded to the *Spiritual*; and a fancy'd *Catholick-Communion*, in Rites and Ceremonies, to one

*Compare a certain Treatise of Union and Communion with Christ Jesus; and two Sermons of the same Persons about Church Communion, with his Treatise of the Unity of the Church, and another of Protestant Principles.*

upon the Terms of *common Christianity*; It might seem strange to have the old Cant revived by one of less Art, though smoother Address: Were it not that the Errors of the Leaders of any Party stand for Maxims and Principles, till plainly retracted. And though the Mortification may be severe to Flesh and Blood; yet whoever has serv'd the Papists or Arbitrary Power with his Doctrines, ought, if he be of Reputation with his Party, the rather to suffer an Eclipse of his Fame by coming to the Stool of Repentance, lest that very Fame help to spread the Contagion, and make his Errors Canonical. The Church indeed, whose Articles and Homilies they profess to receive, is far from authorizing their Conceits: but Men are apt to believe that they hear the Voice of the Church from the Pulpit; and that the *Priest's Lips preserve* the true *Knowledge*; yet I think no Man need desire greater Advantage for confuting their Ecclesiastical or Civil Politicks, than the laying hold of what themselves own in cool Blood.

Though the Doctor, on whom I now animadvert, has nothing of any Moment, but what we may easily trace him in from one of the Leaders: Yet in one respect he is himself an Original; being the first, who, to use his excellent Chime, has admonish'd Men, though the Law has given them *Liberty of Conscience, to make Conscience of their Liberty*: Or that charges the Protestant Dissenters with *Schism*, notwithstanding the *Legal Indulgence or Ease*.

Page 27.

*Ibid.*

Which

Which though I must own to be but an Opiate, which allays, but does not remove the Distemper; yet I cannot for my life understand how Non-compliance with Rites and Ceremonies instituted by humane Laws, should be a Schism, when the same Law allows a Liberty: and would gladly know what is that Law of Christ which is *immutable and not to be repealed*, obliging Men to communicate in those Rites and Ceremonies, which he never enjoyned; nor were enjoyned by any Law, but what ceases to be one to him, whom it allows in a Dissent from those who are in possession of the Profits. Page 28.

If it be said, That he charges Schism only upon such as *Hypocritically and Maliciously make Breaches and Disturbances in a Church, to revenge or advance themselves by the ruin of it.* Page 24.

1st. It is evident, that if he do not insinuate that all Dissenters are thus Guilty, he therein departs from his Question, which is of such as upon *dissatisfaction divide, and will not join with us.* Page 15.  
& 23.

2ly. Even these, as such, are terrified with *what the Fathers have declared about this Matter, that is, dividing upon Dissatisfaction*: Upon which, he says, *the Fathers, considering the ill effects and consequences of Schism, have pronounced it as heinous a Sin as any whatsoever.* Page 23.

Wherefore the matter to which this Censure is apply'd, being *dividing upon Dissatisfaction*; this, if he speak consistently, is *Schism* in the Language of the Fathers. Nor can any Inconsistencies or Contradictions be thought to qualify positive Assertions, till they are as positively renounc'd.

Nay, he says in another Place, that *though the Recusants here are greater Schismatics than any other* Page 12.



Page 27.

other Separatists among us: Yet neither can any of the other that separate, well clear themselves from being such. So that according to him, the Protestant Dissenters in general (not only such as maliciously and hypocritically make Breaches) cannot well clear themselves from being Schismaticks. And he advises such Dissenters not to presume and encourage themselves in that Separation, which he will have to be causeless, because the Laws of the Land are so favourable to inflict no Penalties upon them for it. These, says he, do not undertake to justify the Thing, as if it were no Sin, only forbear to judg in it, and leave us wholly to the Law of Christ, which is immutable, and not to be repealed.

So that he, it seems, is wiser than the Law, and does judg them guilty of this Sin of Schism, though the Law forbears to judg so. But there is more than this in the matter, and little less than a Reflection upon the Parliament, for making a Sin before God lawful to be committed: And if Schism be as heinous a Sin as any, and yet the Parliament makes this lawful; others will say, it might better make Murder so far lawful as to take off the Sanction by Penalties, which the Laws against it have. For admit all humane Penalties were taken away from Murder, it would be no less a Sin in the Eyes of all Men. Whereas in this case a Man incurs the danger of sinning in the Doctor's sense, without a sufficient Buoy: For, as all Religious Assemblies, with other Rites and Ceremonies than those which are used according to our Liturgy, were forbidden to Protestants only by Statute-Law upon certain Penalties; many cannot but think, that the Act which takes away those Penalties from Protestant

testant Assemblies, makes those Assemblies lawful. And if it be a Sin for them still to assemble together, though the Penalties are abolish'd the removing of them would but lead Men into Temptation: and the Statute become a *Legal Snare* in lieu of the *Page 27.*  
*Illegal one.*

I remember the time when Clergy-Men thought it their Interest to maintain that the Sanction of a meer positive Law lies in the Penalty. Wherefore some would ask what now becomes of the Laws about Conformity, the Penalties being taken away? Though I must own the late Act to be penn'd with abundant Caution, to prevent the Cavils of a nice sort of Men; yet it speaks of *separate Assemblies for Religious Worship permitted or allowed by it.* And gives such encouragement to them, as to exempt their Preachers from certain secular Employments, the better to attend to the Work of their Ministry. And tho God Almighty may permit or suffer Sin, as he does not necessitate the avoiding it, yet he cannot be said to allow it, (it being difficult to distinguish between allowing and approving) much less can he be thought to encourage it. Nor can that be thought a Sin, against which he has denounced no Judgment, especially where he declares there shall be none. And if any thing became a Sin by humane Law, if that declare there shall be no Penalty, one would take it to be a virtual declaring, that it ceases to be a Sin; unless we can imagine that the Law which frees the Body, would ensnare the Mind. Nay, the Doctor seems to forget that he had called the late Act, *an Indulgence* *Page 27.*  
*granted the Dissenters,* in the Page immediately before

*Vid. Grand Question concerning the Bishops voting in Cases Capital, Pag. 68. The Sanction of the Law is ceas'd which was irregularity, Pag. 69. If the irregularity be taken away, the Sanction is gone. And if the Sanction be taken off in a meer positive Law, the force of the Law is gone too. And therefore this Canon Law which forbids Clergy-Men being present in Capital-Cases and giving Votes therein, is wholly taken away by the Reformation.*

his Assertion, that the *Laws do not undertake to justify the Thing* he was then speaking of, which was the *Liberty of Conscience* which they give, *as if it were no Sin*: Which surely is a palpable Reflection that the *Laws give indulgence to Sin*.

But in charging this Sin of Schism, the Doctor here must needs go upon the Supposition that the Terms of Communion with the Church of England are enjoyed by *Christ's immutable Law*: Upon which I dare say the Dissenters will readily join Issue. Nor do they believe that Christ has made any Law for England but what he has made for all Mankind.

Yet the Doctor thinks he had proved them guilty from the Notion of Schism: it being, as he says, *the strict and proper Notion of Schism for Persons causlessly to rend themselves from the particular Church whereof de jure they are Members*.

If it be causlessly in the Judgment of the Party that divides, it were something: But according to him, the Protestant Dissenters who divide upon *Dissatisfaction*, notwithstanding such real *Dissatisfaction*, without any thing of *Malice* or *Hypocrisy*, are *Schismatics*: For he will have their Division to be *causless* in it self. For such to say they agree in *Doctrinals*, it

vid. Dr.  
Bring-  
hurst's  
Sermon be-  
fore the Ld.

*is only upon account of Ceremonies that they separate, seemeth* (says he) *so far from excusing the Thing, it really maketh it worse*.

Mayor, May 26. 1689. *The Spirituality of God's Worship under the Gospel being a necessary qualification of it; some Men may possibly scruple without any Malice or ill Design, some Rites or Usages in the Worship of God as being contrary to its Spirituality. Nothing but Order and Decency may be designed by them, or some external Ornaments for the Service of God, and by a fair and rational Interpretation, they may be found without being impediments to the purity and Spirituality of Divine Worship; yet seeing all Men cannot have the same sense of these things, and seeing what a Man scruples, he can never be edified by it, we are to consider the infirmities of our Brethren, for Order and Decency here is best; when they are in subservency to Edification.*



But since Men are not apt to make due Allowances for humane Infirmities, till the Case comes to be their own; it may not be amiss to put it so, as may affect some of our present Clergy. For them to rend themselves from their People, and to intermit or wholly leave off their Ministry causlessly, must needs be as Schismatical, and as great a Breach of the Political Union, as for the People causlessly to separate from them. But we say, and are ready to prove, that they who are suspended, or may be depriv'd for refusing to take the Oath of Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, causlessly rend themselves from their People. If they say that they really scruple, Why should causless Scruples excuse them from Schism, and not the more ignorant Laity? If it is so far from excusing the last, that it makes it worse that they scruple not upon account of Doctrinals, the same will return upon them, whose Scruples are founded upon a supposed knowledg of humane Law, in which they are evidently mistaken. And herein the Point turns the stronger upon them, that whereas the Law with great Equity gives Indulgence to Consciences scrupulous about Religious Worship, and doubtful of the Power of humane Laws concerning it: the Law neither does nor can without Injury to the Publique give Indulgence to them, who, unless they give reasonable Assurance of Fidelity, are to be look'd upon as of a contrary Allegiance; and so no Friends to the Power which protects them. And this is the rather to be believed, because no Man who will take any promisory Oath, can scruple swearing Allegiance now, but upon Supposition that the subject matter of his former Oath remains, and the late King still continues his Leige

Lord, according to the Laws of the English Government. For Allegiance must follow the Law; it being nothing more than the Fidelity and Obedience which the Law requires. Were it more, we should swear our selves Slaves, and the King Absolute.

Though in relation to a future State, it may be too severe to charge all Men of Understanding with the immediate and obvious Consequences of what they hold; many being better than their Principles: Yet it may be as needful for Civil Governments to judg accordingly, as to preserve themselves. But as poor Dissenters are supposed to be shut out of God's Church, and depriv'd of all the ordinary means of Salvation, because of their Mistakes; 'tis requisite thus to turn the Question upon them who cast the first Stone.

And some will be ready to suggest, that Obstinacy, Vanity to be at the Head of a Party, an Expectation of being considerable enough to be bought off, too great Pride to acknowledg an Error, or the like, are more truly Ingredients in the Clerical Schism, than Malice or Hypocrisy in that which the Laity are aspers'd with.

But to return to our Doctor. He had own'd that *Christ's Mystical Body is an Aggregation or Collection of all throughout the Face of the Earth who embrace the Faith he hath delivered.* From St. Austin he tells us, *Schismaticks are not to be look'd upon as Christians.*

And yet they who agree in the same Faith, and separate, or are driven or kept out only upon the account of Ceremonies, nor are charg'd with want of Charity, are *Schismaticks* with him: and that though many of them were bred up under other Pastors,  
and



and cannot be said to have rent themselves from the Church of *England*.

This indeed must be said for him, that though *St. Austin*, and other antient Fathers, make no Degrees of Schism, and knew of none, but in such as divide out of Malice or Hypocrisy, or at least from such terms as Christ required: Our Doctor makes Degrees of *Schism* without Authority from the Apostles, or the Fathers. He tells us, some are greater *Schismatics* than others; yet the least are guilty of the Sin of *Schism*. And so perhaps we may find a *Schism* which is not a Rent from God's Church, nor a Breach of Charity among Christians: And then I would gladly know how the Nature of *Schism* remains?

And indeed it is evident that as he applies the Name of *Schismatics* to them *who embrace the Faith Christ has deliver'd*; and whom he cannot in general charge with dividing from other Christians out of Hypocrisy or Malice: he imputes Schism to them who certainly remain true Members of God's Church, and maintain that Bond which unites them to their Fellow-Christians.

Yet notwithstanding all the seeming Softnings, 'tis plain the Doctor will not allow such to be true Members of God's Church: For, he says, to be a *Member of the Catholick*, 'tis necessary to be of some *particular Church*. Nor can it be deny'd that he charges the Protestant Dissenters with failure of what is necessary to being of the Catholick Church. And though in the Choice of Churches he restrains it to such as God may be acceptably served in: Yet I shall soon shew he makes it absolutely necessary to be of some visible Church, and therein agrees with the

Papists; and differs only, in that he will have the Church of *England* so called, that is, they who are united under the same Ecclesiastical Polity, to be the Church. Yet some would think that as *Christ's mystical Body*, or Church Universal, is a *Collection of all throughout the Face of the Earth, who embrace the Faith Christ has delivered*: Wherein, according to this Doctor himself, Visibility is by no means essential to the being of the Church-Universal, (for embracing the Faith is a pure Act of the Mind) so the Church of *England*, as it is a part of the whole, is a Collection of them who embrace that Faith in *England*. Every part must be in some place: but it would not cease to be a part if there were no other part upon the place to join with. And therefore a single Person may make as true a part of Christ's Body, as the greatest Numbers.

Page 18. But examine the ground for the Imputation of *Schism* upon our Protestant Dissenters, because they *causelessly divide or rend themselves from that Church of which de jure they are Members*. This he had explained before, where he says, *that I call every Mans particular Church, not which it may be he himself doth call so, but which the lawful Authority of the Country where he liveth hath made so*.

Page 18. Now I would gladly know by what Law Dissenters are still obliged to conform to the Ceremonies of our Church, and in that respect to become Members? Is it because the Law leaves others the Possession of the material Churches made with Hands? This indeed I think he offers at, when he tells us *how they under whose spiritual Conduct such Persons put themselves, can satisfy their own Minds, he knows not*.

But I should think they might say, Are Ye Ministers of the Gospel? So are We. Are Ye to take care of the Flock over which Christ hath made you Overseers? So are We. Nay, what if they should say, Your Bishops look over the Clergy and not the Flock: Your inferior Clergy are not Pastors, but Curates to the Bishops: Wherefore we are ready to enter upon the Trial, which of us are most properly Pastors of Christ's Institution.

*Vid. The Prayer in the Lyturgy for Bishops and Curates; and at the Consecration of Bishops: Bishops the Pastors of the Church.*

*Vid. The same Protestant Principles.*

Or what if they should say farther; Your Bishops Lord it over the Flock, and contrary to the Apostolick Example, and the antient usage in *England*, claim a Power of making *Laws, Canons, and Constitutions in the Church* without the Laity; with this only difference among them, that some place the Power in every single Bishop, and so far are *Independants*; others in the *Episcopal Colleged*, or Assembly of all the Bishops in a Kingdom: The last of which I think is most agreeable to their Notion who are only for a National Church: the others seem not aware, that, according to them, every distinct Diocess makes a Church. And if it should fall out that the primitive Diocesses were but single Assemblies of them who worship'd God in the same place with *one Heart and one Mind*, though with different Postures, then every Protestant Congregation may chance to put in for as compleat a Church as any: and others may be as great *Schismaticks* in refusing to Communicate with them, as they for not Communicating with others.

*Vid. Spelm Council de modo tenendi Synodos apud Anglos.*

*Vid. Protestant Principles Licens'd.*

*Vid. Protestant Principles*

*Vid. Clarkson's Primitive Episcopacy.*



Pag. 18. *They under whose spiritual Conduct such Persons put themselves.*

*Na he no where takes the Ministers for Brethren.*

The Doctor indeed, speaking of the Dissenting Ministers receiving those whom he takes *de jure* to be Members of the Church of England, says, *How opposite soever they may be to the Pope in other matters, in this his Usurpation they agree with him, and can no more be justify'd in it than he.*

And thus in the Spirit of Meekness and with many gentle stroakings to the Laity, the Preachers are call'd Usurpers, the hearers Schismaticks.

For my part, waving the Question about a compleat Pastor, and the due Government of the Church, I should rather fear that the Charge of Schism might be retorted upon them, whoever they are, who so far usurp upon Christ's Office, as to make more or other Terms of Communion than Christ hath made. And whosoever insist upon Conformity to other Terms, I should think to be real *Schismaticks*, how-much soever others suffer under the Name.

Sure I am Schism lies in something else besides causeless Separation from external Communion: for otherwise the Apostle would never have charg'd it upon them who continued in the same external Communion; as did the *Corinthians*, to whom alone he appli'd the word. If the Apostle applied this to them who continued the same external Communion, and never to them who divided or separated from such Communion; 'tis evident *Schism* does not lie in Separation from external Communion, though there may be *Schism* in the Separation. I take it not to lie so much in divided Communions, as the uncharitableness of them on either side.

*Vid. 1 Cor. 12. 25. that there should be no Schism in the Body, but that the Members should have the same care one for another.*

As Schism is a Rent, we shall never know what sort of Rent is Schism, till we settle the bond of Union,

on, which I should think to be Charity : For they who are united in the same Faith and external Communion, may be guilty of Schism, both in Relation to others, and among themselves ; which they who maintain that perfect bond of Charity cannot be, in either Respect.

But evident it is that the Papists, and others from them, have taken up a Notion of *Schism* which the Apostle never mentioned. And, according to this Doctor himself, was never intended by St. *Austin*, or other antient Fathers. And if the Livings will not satisfy our *Pluralists*, unless the Non-conformists be exposed, as the Christians of old, in the skins of wild Beasts, to be hunted down, they will find their Congregations thinner than yet they are : for it is not to be thought that the Laity in general will Countenance this Uncharitableness, and Communicate with them in this real *Schism*. But let them not any longer hang up that *Theological Scarecrow Schism*, till their Church, or rather aggregation of Churches, is wide enough to comprehend all Christians. But till it is so, why may it not be enough for us here, to do as he shews to be our Duty in Relation to other Christian Churches abroad, *mutually to own and Acknowledg every one the other, as far as they own and acknowledg Christ.*

*Vid. Gal. I.  
2. unto the  
Churches  
of Galatia.*

Page 25.

‘ Indeed he says, *Inasmuch as to be a Member of the* *Ibid.*  
 ‘ *Catholick Church it is necessary to be of some particular*  
 ‘ *Church : if he may acceptably serve God, and finally save*  
 ‘ *his Soul in it, every Person ought for Peace and*  
 ‘ *Order sake to live in Communion of that Church,*  
 ‘ *where the Providence of God hath plac’d him, and*  
 ‘ *not for every Dislike, Defect, or Blemish, to depart*  
 ‘ *from it.*

Here he manifestly speaks of a visible Church, to which Men must outwardly conform for Peace and Order. This he owns that Men are not oblig'd to conform to, unless they may *acceptably serve God* in it. Yet without observing that, it is possible for the Church, where the Providence of God has plac'd a Man, to be such an one, as God cannot be acceptably served in it. (Though indeed this is implied in the *if it may*, for as it may be, it may not be.) He makes the being a Member of a Particular Church necessary to being of the Catholick; and by Consequence, to Salvation. And yet it is a very great Question how a Man can *serve God acceptably* in any Church, which he believes has such *Defects* or *Blemishes*, as justify his Separation for the sake of a Communion with fewer *Defects*, or *Blemishes*. And I know not what can hinder such a Communion from making a visible Church wherein he may *serve God acceptably*. Or why the external Peace and Order in a Church, for all to move together like a piece of Clock-work, should be perferr'd before his spiritual Advantages. And now the Law allows a Liberty, some will think that they who leave the Parochial Worship for the sake of another Religious Meeting, are no more *Schismatics*, than they who refuse to Communicate in the Cathedrals, for the sake of Parochial Worship with fewer Ceremonies.

But suppose all Churches or Communion visible, should impose Terms which a Man conscientiously scruples: What hinders but the same *Lord*, the same *Faith*, the same *Baptism*, with a readiness, as far as he has attained, to walk by the same Rule with all Christians, may rather make him a Member of Christ's Family both here and in Heaven, than that his scruples in other matters, wherein he has not attained



tained to the Sentiments of Men of larger Capacities and Opportunities, should shut him out, and leave him *extra Ecclesiam foras*.

Thus I have set those Notions in their proper Light, which are such *means to remedy our Differences*, as *Procrustes* his bed for the different lengths of Mens bodies. Vid. pag. 14

And methinks this *Procrustian* humour is pretty evident, where he vindicates the vein of Creed-making, while he condemns the Church of *Rome* for her uncharitableness in damning all that come not punctually up to her Tenents: which though himself does not directly, it will appear that he, by a Consequence of his own, damns all them, who do not in matters of belief comply with the Church where they live, when that Church is such an one as he supposes, a Man may *serve God acceptably, and finally save his Soul in it*.

So far, says he, was the ancient Church from it, Page 9.  
 that all the *Credenda* she requir'd of them she admitted to her Communion, for some ages, was only an Acknowledgment of the Articles of the Creed we call the *Apostles*, and prest no more on them; and though all Churches since have added others some more some less; it appeareth by their not judging one another about receiving or not receiving them, this is not so much from any Opinion they have of the absolute Necessity of holding those Articles, as of the absolute Necessity of preserving Peace among their own Members, who were like to make Disturbances about them.

Wherein there is couch't this excellent Paradox, that it is absolutely necessary for the Peace of some particular Churches, that, before Men be admitted into Communion, they should receive some Articles of belief which are not of Universal Obligation, and by consequence are more

than Christ or his Apostles required.

So that it seems Men are to be deprived of Church-Communion, for matters of Belief enjoy'd by meer humane Authority, and some who talk high for Catholick-Communion, themselves shut the doors against it.

It is needful to be a Christian, but it would certainly be much better for Mankind, than it is, if they would be so wise to take neither side, while Church-men play their Prizes.

Few that are not wedded to a Party, and think it needful to make Peace by the Destruction of all but their own Faction, can believe that new Impositions, especially in matters of Belief, are any other than the occasions of Differences, and the Shiboletths which divide the Christian World: Nor can they comprehend why any thing should be needful to be believed in one Church, which is not in every Church.

It may often be requisite, for Peace sake, to Provide that no Man hold publickly any thing contrary to a received form of Words; but whoever impose them as terms of Communion, ought to produce a Warrant from Divine Authority.

To be of the Catholick Church is necessary to Salvation, and if, as Men of the Doctors Sentiments contend, no Man can be of the Catholick, who is not of the particular Church where he lives, if that be a true Church, or such an one in which he may serve God acceptably, and finally save his Soul; Then such a Church, requiring other Articles of Belief, or in other words than Christ or his Apostles required, makes those Articles necessary to Salvation: and if they who are shut out of one true Church, ought not to be admitted into any other, without



Letters Commendatory from the Church, of which he had been, or *de jure* was a Member; then at least there may be a total Exclusion from the Catholick Church for such terms as Christ or his Apostles never required: and thus Men may become Schismaticks for *Doctrinals* as well as Ceremonies, which they honestly scruple. They who hold this, would do well to preach up St. *Zavierus* his new Gospel, invented with the like pious Intention: But when they talk of these things for the Peace of the Church, I cannot but apply the old observation, *solitudinem faciunt, & pacem vocant*: but for certain, how merciful soever God Almighty may be hereafter; you must believe as the Church where you live believes, if you would have Peace here.

*Vid. Dr. Stillingfleets Fannaticism of the Church of Rome.*

But if there ought to be a Catholick Communion on Earth, and they who are deprived of one Churches Communion, ought to be of all; this shews how necessary it is that Communion should be upon terms truly Catholick.

The contrary to the other Notion shines methinks with native Light, in an excellent Discourse of my learned Friend, Dr. *Bringhurst*, who adorned his Doctrine, by a steady Adherence to it in the worst of times.

‘ We, says he, make this Yoke and Burden un-  
 ‘ easier than Christ has made it to one another,  
 ‘ when we impose, as necessary Articles of our Faith,  
 ‘ either what it is certain our Saviour and his Apo-  
 ‘ stles never imposed, or uncertain whether they did  
 ‘ or no.

*Vid. Dr. Bringhursts Sermon before the Lord Mayor, May 26, 1689. Page 24.*

‘ Articles of Faith necessary to Salvation can de-  
 ‘ rive Authority from none but God; he only can tell  
 ‘ us what will be acceptable to himself, so that the  
 ‘ Scriptures only of the Old and New Testament (by  
 ‘ all

‘ all Protestants,) being the Revelation that God hath  
 ‘ given of his Will in this case to us; Whatever is  
 ‘ made necessary that is not here, must be a very un-  
 ‘ easy Yoke and heavy Burden: for ’tis not in a  
 ‘ Mans Power to believe as Men would have him;  
 ‘ we cannot believe beyond our Evidence; and our  
 ‘ Evidence must be as we can understand it; so that  
 ‘ what is necessary must be supposed to be intelligibly  
 ‘ revealed to all concerned in the Belief of it.

Vid. P. 3.

Wherever  
 the Scrip-  
 ture it self

does imprint a Character of necessity, either for Faith or Practice, we cannot speak plainer to one another than that doth to us: And if any thing be revealed which we cannot comprehend, as for Instance, the Article of the Trinity, yet the Revelation is plain; and in all matters of Revelation we are to believe no more than is revealed, and no otherwise of it, than as it is revealed, &c.

‘ This hath often made me think that we should  
 ‘ be easier to one another, were the Articles of our  
 ‘ Faith given us in the very words of the Scripture.  
 ‘ I am sure that both the *Orthodox* and the *Arians*  
 ‘ in the Council of *Nice* concurred in this; that all  
 ‘ the *Mischiefs in the Church of God were caused by*  
 ‘ *bringing in words into the Creeds of the Church,*  
 ‘ *which were not in the Scriptures.* Consequences in-  
 ‘ deed are as sure as the express terms of the Scrip-  
 ‘ tures, but Infallibility in these Consequences, seems  
 ‘ to be necessary for Articles of Faith, because infal-  
 ‘ lible Authority only can create them. *Certainty*  
 ‘ *may satisfy a Man’s Conscience for his own sense and*  
 ‘ *Compliance, but for terms of Communion that may not*  
 ‘ *be sufficient,* because that is so according to Mens  
 ‘ different Capacities and Apprehensions, &c. *We*  
 ‘ *are to believe no more than the Word of God declares*  
 ‘ *to us, and also as it declares it;* and if we desire  
 ‘ more of one another, we make Christ’s Yoke more  
 ‘ uneasy, and his Burden heavier than he hath made  
 ‘ it.

As all Men are presumed to have some end in what they do, unless where they act in passion without Consideration: It were worth enquiring to what end this Sermon (which, for the sake of my Country, I cannot but disrobe) was preach'd at this time? Was it to convince the Dissenters? Then since he could not expect that such should be his Hearers, it must have been preach'd to be printed. Which may take off Mens Surprize at such a Command, more likely to be obtained, than given *ex mero motu*: Unless it should proceed from Dislike, and be intended, as it has proved, a gentle enjoyning of publick Penance: which all must agree to be suitable to his Majesties great Judgment and Clemency. However there was small reason to believe, that they were thus to be brought over now, who persisted in their Dissent, when they could not serve God in publick without being made Rioters: And to be a Dissenter, was counted not only a *Dividing from God's Church*, but the being of a Faction against the *State*. And in all respects both themselves, and all who wish'd well to them, suffered accordingly.

Was it to induce his Majesty to withdraw his Protection and Favour from such; as being shut out from God's care, and not worthy of his Majesties? But surely 'tis not to be supposed that his Majesty, who had reason to believe that he *serv'd God acceptably in Holland*, where there was no *National Church*; should be perswaded of the Necessity of being a Member of such a particular Church, that one may be a *Member of the Catholick*. Was it to raise a Contempt of the Protestant Dissenters in the Generality of the Hearers; and thence to animate a party for the Church? This may with better ground be look'd on as the encouraging a Faction against the State,



State, at a time when the Union of Protestants is little less than essential to its being.

Whoever goes to make the King, a King of one party of Protestants, under a pretence of advancing the Interest of the Church of *England*, would certainly have a Reward according to his Merit, if the late King should by the Advantages such put into his Hands, come again to be its *Defender*.

Such must understand, that though the greater part of the Nation have fewer Scruples than the Dissenters have; yet, as they are united with them in the same Profession of Faith, and Affection to the present Government; they cannot but desire to live with them as Men who must stand or fall by the same common Interest.

And if they who are otherwise minded are not guilty of making a *Schism* in the State, I am sure they who refuse to swear Allegiance to King *William* and *Queen Mary*, are. And this more truly answers the *Apostles* Notion of *Schism*, than that which Clergy-men have taken up to keep together a Party, which, if they give the Word, may be, and often have been, troublesome to Civil Governments. Unreasonable Quarrels, and Strifes, proceeding from Pride, and carnal Considerations, are the most truly *Schismatical*. And why the Dissenters may not be even with many of them in returning the Censure, I see no reason. Sure I am, they have had more tender Usage than the *Dissenters* had. Their Consciences were to be admitted to labour with Qualms for many Months: In which time a great Judgment might be made, which side would be uppermost: Whereas the poor Dissenters must in an instant be resolved of all their Scruples, or yield to a speedy Deprivation, without any intermediate Suspension, to  
bring

bring them to consider, by feeling a temporary loss.

Some may think this an uncharitable Insinuation, that the Clergy by their Friends prest for so long time, till they might see which side would prevail. But besides that the Points in question might otherwise soon be determined one way or other : this can be no great doubt to them, who have heard how many were seized with suddain Scruples, upon the flying report of General Maccay's being routed; or who consider upon what Ground many of them have prayed for King *William*; which is barely as he is King *de facto*, as appears by their now declining to swear Allegiance to him. And of them who swear Allegiance, some at least go upon the same Ground. Or if more, as his Title is allowed of by the Law, and conferr'd with those Formalities of Law, and with those usual Ceremonies and Rites, which customarily are observ'd in the most regular Collation of Titles. Wherein that Clergy-Man who offers Considerations for taking the Oath of Allegiance, leaves a Surmise that our King's Title may not have been according to the strict Rules of Justice, as being obtained by due means, or conferred without Injustice or Injury done to any Person; which he distinguishes from a Title barely allowed of by the Law. Nay, he manifestly supposes that the late King is injured; he being God's Ordinance, the Minister of God for good, not to be resisted, and we bound to be subject to him, however he demeaned himself in the Exercise of the Government. And this he applies equally to wicked Magistrates, who act without regard to those Bounds which the Law has set them, And even Usurpers; that is, to Usurpers both of Power and of Title, as long as they are in Possession. But herein only is he unequal, that whereas he tells us that *though Princes exert Power*

Considerations for taking the Oath of Allegiance. Page 53.

Page 46, & 47.

Page 50.

Page 56. *without due Title or Commission from God: that is, are Usurpers of Power, we are bound to suffer patiently, and be subject for Conscience towards God, and cannot forceably resist them without Peril of Damnation: Yet when he speaks of a King de facto, coming in with usual Formalities of Law, suppos'd by him to be an Usurper of Title, he says that which we translate Damnation, is vengeance, that is, Judgment: And Treason against a King de facto is punishable by the Judgment of Death. This is Treason by our Law; and I do thus offend by levying War against the King for the time being, though in favour of a King de jure. It may be Judgment to resist the King de facto, in favour of a King de jure, i. e. it may be an offence which by the Law may render me obnoxious to Judgment. And by Consequence, a Man may rebel against the King de facto, whenever he has Opportunity or fair Prospect of Impunity here, and may be subject for Wrath, but not for Conscience sake. In short, if you resist him, you shall be hang'd; if you resist the other, you shall be damn'd.*

Page 34. *Not the Power in being while incapable by being out of Possession to exercise any Act belonging to the Supream Power, So. Pa. 37.*

Suppose then that the late King, encourag'd by them who believe him still to continue King de jure, should land here with *French and Irish* Forces, having their Commissions seal'd within the Kingdom: according to this Doctrine, neither he, nor the Forces commissioned by him, are to be resisted: Nor is our King to expect Assistance from such Men in other Exigencies. Taxes indeed 'tis confess'd are to be paid as a Salary for his protecting them, for this very cause that he attends continually upon the Government. Yet it may be a Question whether they would not think that the others presence might discharge or transfer the Taxes. But as for our Endeavours to keep  
King



*King William in his Station by our Arms, according to this Divine, It can only be so far our Duty, as it is lawful so to do; which is as much as to say, it is no Duty at all, but is left indifferent, whether you will exercise your lawful Power or no.*

Page 56.

Nor, says he, *Do I find St. Paul inculcating it as any part of our Subjection to the higher Powers.*

This goes upon the Notion of a certain Leading Man, who makes *Non-Resistance to be absolute Subjection, and as much as can or ought to be required by the Sovereign Power*: as if active Obedience to lawful Commands were not in the least imply'd in being subject. But I take *ὑποτάσσειν*, the Word which the *Apostle* uses, chiefly to import Action in a regular Discharge of the Duties of an Inferiour to his Superior; and when *St. Peter* uses the same Word in Relation to every *humane Ordinance or Creature*, *ὑποτάξτε πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις ἡσίου*, I would gladly know whether 'tis meant of the Fountain and Derivation of Power; or else of the Commands issuing from the Power?

If the first, then the right of the *late King* was not, as some contend, such as *no Religion, no Law, no Fault or Forfeiture can alter or diminish*: If the last, then active Obedience to lawful Commands is required by the very Letter: but I cannot see how the

*Vid. History of Passive Obedience.*

Page 106.

same Text should require passive Obedience to unlawful Commands; any more than it does active; and whoever does not actively obey the lawful ones, does as much resist the Power, nay more than he who resists a Person assuming a Power which never was given him by God or Man. He says farther, *Nor doth our Law since the Cessation of the Tenure of Knights Service, require it personally of all Subjects; at least, we of the Clergy cannot be concern'd in it; because we by so many Statutes are exempted from bearing Arms.*

Page 59.

Herein he shews that he talks out of his Profession; for as to Personal Service, whatever might be requisite in *Grand Serjeanty*, by which a Man is to be the *King's Champion*, or the like in his own Person; 'tis evident *Knights Service* was not personal; for otherwise it had been impossible for a Man who held several Knights Fees, to have discharged the Duty of his tenure.

Even where there was no Knight's Service anti-ently, and since its being taken away, all Men have been, and yet are oblig'd to provide Arms, and the Bodies of Men, either their own or others, for the Defence of the Kingdom, according to their Estates real or personal. Nor have the Clergy any Exemption for this: Neither do the Acts establishing a Militia, discharge any Man from this, which is a Duty at Common Law; of which the *Confessors Law*, and the Statute of *Winchester* are declaratory.

But what ever Exemption Clergy-men have, it is because of their Attendance in their Ministerial Office; upon which account the dissenting Ministers have the like Exemption by the late Statute. What then if any of our Clergy decline swearing Allegiance till the time of Deprivation incurs? may and will they still exercise their Function? If they may and will, why might not they as well who were turn'd out by the *Bartholomew Act*? If they may not or will not, what Exemption can they claim more than Lay-men? If they say still their Character is indelible, Is no Duty annexed to the Character?

But is not this fine Doctrine to be insinuated now; as if no Man were obliged to endeavour by Arms to keep our *King* in his *Station*? Or if other Men are, at least not Clergy-men: But that if you resist him by Arms, nothing but want of Success can make it criminal?

Sure



Sure I am that egregious Pattern of Christian fortitude Mr. *Johnson*, on whom this Author reflects, was degraded by his Brethren, and delivered over to the secular scourge, for less than this.

When I consider how earnestly this Man presses taking the Oaths, I cannot but think of the Advice said to be given by the late King to his Friends here, That as many of them as can should get into Offices. And we may hence observe what is to be expected from those *Clergy-Men*, who take the Oath of Allegiance with a Protestation, that they do it barely as to a King *de facto*: their Loyalty may vie with St. *Becket's*, who was for swearing to the King with a *salvo jure* to the Pope: whether such ought to be suffer'd to spread their Doctrines with a Face of Authority, and what Punishments they deserve, who accept of such Protestations, I submit to my Superiors. But sure I am this will not be enough in Law to keep their Livings, unless they are favour'd by an undue entry upon Record.

Yet who can chuse but wonder how from the same Text, a Clergy Man should enforce the Obligation of submitting to a Tyrant in the exercise of Power, upon pain of Damnation, and yet make the Penalty less in the case of resisting one, who is really *God's ordinance*, as he is a *Minister of Good*, but in his opinion wants Title, though the Law be on his side. This can be for no other Reason, but that whatsoever becomes of the State, Church-Men must not recede from their darling-Notion of *Non-resistance*. And rather than they should be thought *Ecclesiastical Weather-cocks*, the State must be turn'd round again into Confusion. Nor do they care how much they reflect upon those noble Patriots, who invited this King when he was Prince, and appeared in Arms with

*Vid. pag. 41 without condemning the Doctrins of Non-resistance.*

*Ibid.*

with him for the Protestant Cause; If they can but free their *Coat* from the necessity of retracting those *Slavish Doctrines*, which though many of them have renounced in their *Actions* they would still justify in Principle. And as it is to be presum'd that every Man will act according to his Principle when he has an inviting Opportunity; I leave it to all impartial Men to consider, which are most likely to be true to the present Government, they who believe the Sovereign Power *inseparable from the Person of the late King*, that they were in a State of Damnation who offered to resist his Arbitrary Usurpations, that themselves are exempted from assisting this Government with their Persons or their Arms in the utmost Extremity, and may resist when they are likely to escape temporal Judgment: Or they who are ready to hold to the Death, that our present King has as good a Title as ever King of *England* had; Which has already been evinced in some Measure; And did the Men of Scruples vouchsafe to produce any colourable Objection, should be farther.

Vid. *Jovon. In all sovereign Governments the Subjects are and ought to be slaves if the King please.*

*History of Passive Obedience considered. Vid. Preface.*

Indeed a certain injudicious *Author* has, with a plain evil Design against the present Settlement, heapt up Numbers of Quotations to prove, that it is a *Truth as eternal and unalterable* as any *Doctrine of Christianity*, that a Superior is not in *Things unlawful* to be resisted, upon any pretence whatsoever: in the utmost extent of which Assertion, no sort of *Superior*, Justice of the Peace or other is to be resisted, even where he acts without colour of his Office.

*Ibid.*

But what he drives at is, that Men ought to be *unalterably true to their Oaths*, and suppos'd Duty to the late King: at least he will allow of no discharge in Law sufficient, unless the late King give an express release; and according to his Quotation out of

*Hist. pag. 54.*

Dr.

Dr. Hammond's practical Catechism, will have the Duty of Allegiance to continue *where the supposed legal Sovereign doth still claim his Right to his Kingdoms, and to the Allegiance of his Subjects, no way acquitting them from their Oaths, or laying down his Pretensions, though for the present he be overpower'd.* History, pag. 54.

This I am sure he will never prove to be the steady Doctrine of that Church; which he calls poor and despised, and of whose Interests he pretends to the deepest sense, while he would render it, such, by keeping it too firmly attach'd to the Interest of the late misguided and unfortunate King: let him if he can squeeze this sense out of its Articles or Homilies. Certain it is, he is far from bringing a cloud of Witnesses to his imaginary eternal verity. Preface.

Few of the passages which he cites enforce more than Obedience to lawful Authority: some indeed, and chiefly Persons now alive, let fall expressions through inadvertency, or prevalence of strong Temptations, which 'tis to be hoped that many of them have repented of; since their later Discourses and Practices notoriously contradict them: and surely little proof of the steady Doctrine of a Church can be had from such Inconstancy. I must own that this Collection is to one purpose very useful; for some of them wanted to be thus Admonish'd of their frailty: and 'twill be happy for them, if this Humiliation can expiate for that poison, which has infected many beyond Remedy, from the Antidote they now yield; while out of the Eater comes forth Meat, and themselves pull down that Edifice, which they had been building with great Pains.

But what Rivers can wash away the stain of so much noble Blood, as has been offer'd up to this Moloch, a meer Figure, which some have made to worship?



ship? Had it not been for this *Idol*, worse than ever the *Clowns* chose, the *Earl of Essex*, *Lord Russel*, and *Colonel Sydney* had been now alive in their large Capacities for heroic Actions and wholsom Counsels, as well as in their immortal Memories; and had been as conspicuous now for the reward of their Merit, as they have been for their Sufferings. Under the Protection of this *Figure*, came out that shadow of a *Vindication of the late Magistracy and Government of England*, in Two parts, which are more weak and *Criminal attempts* upon the never-dying Fame of the *Ld. Russel*, than any that he has been prov'd guilty of, otherwise than by a Verdict. The false colours in the first of these

The censure of the two Vindications of the Magistracy and Government of England, written against the defence of Lord Russels Innocence.

have been sufficiently expos'd by *Mr. Hawles*, and the second Anticipated. Both of them, out of pretended Zeal for the present *Government*, justify the last, and therein condemn this, as wanting just Occasion or Foundation: and while the Author labours to wash the *Blackamore* white, he bespatters the Innocent: and yet after his Thundring pretences to mighty feats, all resolves it self into a clearing the then *Recorder*, who pronounc'd Judgment upon the Indictment which was found: but the overruling and imposing *Judges*, the complying *Jury* (who in their passive Obedience to the Bench shew'd how much they had profited by that Doctrine) the scandalous *Evidence*, and stabbing *Rhetorick* of the eager *Counsel*, are left to shift for themselves.

Our *Collector* I find as impotent in his Heat as the *Vindicator*: after all the formidable things which he has produc'd to shew the *remediless Case of Mankind* by the *Encroachments of Princes*; he confesses that where a *Government was founded in compact, and all priviledges Sacred and Civil contrary to that agreement were*

were invaded; this alters the Case, while it can no way hold good in Governments where there is no such Compact.

And herein we are agreed.

*Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta,  
Pulveris exigui jactu composita quiescunt.*

Thus notwithstanding all the flourish of Quotations from *Divines*, he sends us to the *Common-Lawyers*. And one would think he was asleep when he made use of this passage from the witty *Dr. Donne*, Page 40. Though some ancient Greek States which are call'd *Regna Laconica*, because they are shortned and limited to certain Laws; and some States in our time, seem to have conditional and provisional Princes, between whom and Subjects there are mutual and reciprocal Obligations, which if one side break, they fall on the other: Yet that Sovereignty, which is a power to do all things available to the main Ends, resides somewhere, which if it be in the hands of one Man, erects and perfects that *Pambasilia* of which we speak.

If therefore those Expressions which run highest in maintenance of the unalterable Right of Princes, can reasonably be intended only of such as have the Power to do all things available to the main ends of Government, without Limitation to certain Laws; then they who have not this unlimited Power by the Constitution, may be *conditional and provisional Princes*.

Should now our *Historian* strike out all his dead Authors, who have expressions of a quite contrary

import to what he cites from themselves or others, and all those living ones who have contradicted themselves in Words, or a series of Actions; I assure my self his bulky Book would shrink into a very narrow Compass: and yet as it is, himself has condemn'd it to lie for wast paper, till he proves our Government was not *founded in Compact*, and that there are no Limitations by Laws to make it such an one as Dr. *Donne* calls *Laconic*. When he produces his Evidence of a *Pambasilia* here, I should think it no difficult task to convince all but himself of his Error.

I take Judg *Brouhgton* to be the best Resolver of all Scruples in this kind that ever I met with of a *Divine*, even better than that *Great Man*, who as he has been shewn most of his Mistakes upon the *Grand Question*, by that extraordinary Person, lately deceased, Dr. *Twisden*, little inferiour to his Brother Sir *Roger*, so I suppose he is by this time satisfied that the *Fundamental Contract* is not so *invisible*, but it may be found and understood.

The *Collector* refers to a Book, which I must own never to have been master of, written by a Person now of great Eminence and Station, with these Words;

P. 73. *If you charge the Doctrine of absolute Submission as brutish or stupid, or contrary to the Law of Nature, see you do not run into Blasphemy, by charging the Holy one foolishly.*

Some would think the *Obedience without Reserve* required of the Scotch Nation, to be but a due Improvement of this. But I may refer him to the  
Laws



Laws of our Land, common Sense, or the same Persons better thoughts, for a more generous Idea of this matter.

And if our learned *Rabbies* go about to shew, that the frightful Representation which *Samuel* made of the way or manner of future Kings of *Israel*, was Page 59. but the *Jus Regium*, the Fundamental Law of the Kings of *Israel*; and that the Kings of *England* have Page 78. a Supremacy in their Dominion in all Causes Ecclesiastical and Secular, according to the Powers invested in the Jewish Kings under the Law.

Wherein, indeed, I tack together the Proposition of one, in Explanation of the other; yet if the last meant it in the same sense, in which the other explains the Power of the Kings of *Israel*; I may well call for the Pedigree, to prove how our Kings derive their Title to this, or that Law which makes the Jewish Polity Universal: and for a clearer Argument *ad hominem*, I must say, that very *Author's* own Practice is a sufficient Confutation.

But if they who are by the great and magnanimous *Prince*, who now fills the Throne, called to a more perfect Law of Liberty in this Year of *Jubilee*, refuse to be free; I may say, that like the *Hebrew Servant* bought with a price, or rather Slave, in the same case, they should have their *Ears boar'd* to distinguish them from others, who delight not in Slavery.

And if while Blessings, like *God Almighty's*, descend upon the *Evil and the Good*, the Enemies and the Friends to our Peace; my *Fleece*, as that of *Gideon's*, remains unwatered with the Dew of *Heaven*; I  
must

must consider, that even that was to him a Sign of God's Presence.

And tho this should, with former Services to the Publick, be made matter of Accufation, yet ought I not to faint in the Cause of Truth, and my Country; which amidst many Imperfections and Disadvantages; I must avow to the World, from the first dawnings of my Understanding, ever to have serv'd with Sincerity, and the utmost Endeavours of,


S I R,


*Yours most faithfully, &c.*

**FINIS.**

And if while the... like the...  
found upon the... the...  
the... of...  
I...













**SIGN BOOK CARD**  
**AND LEAVE AT**  
**CHARGING DESK**  
**IF BOOK IS TO BE USED**  
**OUT OF THE**  
**LIBRARY BUILDING**

4

y of

141119

